

(1) setting means for setting the communication network to activate call forwarding such that incoming call for the communication apparatus is forwarded to the calling party of the identification information received by said reception means; and

(2) wherein an incoming call, which will be detected at the communication apparatus after the setting by said setting means, is forwarded to the calling party of the identification information by the communication network.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims, for the reasons set forth below.

As to the “setting means” and the wherein clause, Applicant respectfully submits that they are supported in the specification on pages 1-2 (Description of the related art), page 8, lines 12-15 (e.g., step 212), page 13, lines 6-8 (e.g., step 311). As one example discussed in the specification, a well known supplementary service of ISDN is the call forwarding unconditional (CFU). With this service, the user can set the network to perform call forwarding, for example, by informing the network of the telephone number of its own terminal and a forwarded-to-number (e.g., by CFU activation request to the network). Once call forwarding is set, the network forwards incoming calls to the telephone number to the forwarded-to-number. Accordingly, the claims are believed to satisfy the requirements of section 112, paragraph 1.

As to the Examiner’s additional request for Applicant to use claim language like that found in the specification to avoid confusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as written are sufficiently clear and supported (as noted above) by the specification. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

III. Traversing the Finality of the Action

The Examiner states that “Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**” Applicant’s traverse the finality of the rejection of the Office Action of September 24, 2002. As acknowledged by the Examiner, the section 112, paragraph 1 rejection constituted a new ground of rejection. However, the prior requests for reconsideration dated July 18, 2002 and August 19, 2002 in reply to the prior Office Action of March 18, 2002 did not include any amendments and, thus, the Applicant did not necessitate any new ground of rejection. See MPEP §706.07(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the finality of rejection in the Office Action of September 24, 2002.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4534. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.


In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4534. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN

Dated: January 23, 2003

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

By:



James Hwa
Registration No. 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile